🖎 AO 120 (Rev. 2/99)

TO:

## Mail Stop 8 Director of the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

# REPORT ON THE FILING OR DETERMINATION OF AN ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR TRADEMARK

In Comp	liance with 35 § 290 and/or	15 U.S.C. § 1116	you are hereby advised that a	court action ha	as been
filed in the U.S. D	District Court Northern 1	District Califort	ia on the	Patents or	Trademarks:
DOCKET NO.	DATE FILED	U.S. DIST	RICT COURT		
CV 12-06319 JCS	12/12/2012		olden Gate Avenue, 16 <sup>tt</sup>	Floor, San	Francisco CA 94102
PLAINTIFF		I .	EFENDANT	<b>^</b>	
PEBBLE BEACH CO	)		DYNASTY SPAS INC	·	
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER LE PALENT OR TRADEMAKK			
1 02 Ths pgs. 3-4		<u></u>	***see attach complaint***		
2					
3					
4			1177		
5					
In the at	INCLUDED BY		ent(s) have been include		
PATENT OR	DATE OF PATEN	Amendment	Answer Cross	Bilt 🔲	Other Pleading
TRADEMARK NO.	OR TRADEMARI		HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK		
1					
2			····	,	
3					
4					
5					
				,	
In the abo	ove—entitied case, the follow	wing decision has t	een rendered or judgement is	sued:	
				•	
CLERK (BY) I				D.	ATE
Richard W. Wieking		Gina Agustine-Rivas			December 16, 2012



PICHARD WARRENDER 1 TERRENCE MCMAHON (Cal. Bar No. 71910) PHILIP OU (Cal. Bar. No. 259896) 2 McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY LLP 275 Middlefield Rd. 3 Menlo Park, California 94025 Telephone: (650) 815-7400 4 Facsimile: (650) 815-7401 tmcmahon@mwe.com. pou@mwe.com 5 JOHN J. DABNEY (to file pro hac vice application) 6 MARY D. HALLERMAN (to file pro hac vice application) 7 McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 500 North Capitol Street 8 Washington, D.C. 20001 Telephone: (202) 756-8000 9 Facsimile: (202) 756-8087 jdabney@mwe.com, mhallerman@mwe.com 10 Attorneys for Plaintiff Pebble Beach Company 11 12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 14 15 PEBBLE BEACH COMPANY, a California General Partnership, 16 CASE NO. Plaintiff. 17 COMPLAINT FOR TRADEMARK ٧. INFRINGEMENT, UNFAIR COMPETITION, 18 TRADEMARK DILUTION AND FALSE DYNASTY SPAS INC., a Tennessee DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN 19 Corporation, 20 DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL Defendant. 21 Plaintiff Pebble Beach Company ("Plaintiff"), for its Complaint against Defendant 22 Dynasty Spas Inc. ("Defendant"), alleges as follows: 23 THE PARTIES 24 Plaintiff is a California general partnership having its principal place of business in 1. 25 the County of Monterey, California. 26

27

28

-1-

- 2. Plaintiff owns the most famous golf resort in the United States, the Pebble Beach golf resort. Plaintiff owns numerous federally registered marks for PEBBLE BEACH for a variety of goods and services, including for golfing services, resort services and spa services.
- 3. Defendant is a Tennessee corporation, having its principal place of business at 101 Dynasty Way, Athens, Tennessee 37303. Defendant is using Plaintiff's famous and federally registered PEBBLE BEACH mark to advertise, promote and sell spas.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. This is an action for trademark infringement, unfair competition, false designation of origin and trademark dilution under the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1051, et seq. and California law.
- 5. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332 and 1338(a). This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 6. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant. Defendant conducts business in this district, solicits customers in this district and has dealers that conduct business in this district. On information and belief, Defendant has sold or caused others to sell infringing products and distribute infringing advertising in this district. Defendant's website dynastyspas.com advertises Defendant's PEBBLE BEACH products and is available to individuals in this district. Defendant's web site features a 1-800 number which customers in this district can use to contact Defendant about its PEBBLE BEACH spas. Defendant's website lists several distributors located in California, including one or more distributors that serve this district. On information and belief, Defendant targets this judicial district to sell its PEBBLE BEACH products. Defendant's unlawful conduct expressly targeted Plaintiff, who Defendant knew was located in this district and Defendant knew would suffer injury in this district. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391.

### Plaintiff and Its Famous PEBBLE BEACH Trademarks

7. In 1919, Plaintiff opened a golf course and resort, which it called "Pebble Beach."

- 8. Plaintiff has hosted many major golf championships at its Pebble Beach golf course, including the "U.S. Open" in 1972, 1982, 1992, 2000, and 2010.
- 9. Plaintiff's Pebble Beach golf course is consistently ranked among the greatest golf courses by trade publications and others in the golf industry. *Golf Magazine* has proclaimed the Pebble Beach golf course as the greatest golf course in the world. *Golf Digest* has ranked Pebble Beach as the No. 1 golf course in the United States.
- 10. For decades, professional golf and travel writers and others have written thousands of unsolicited articles in major golf, general interest, and travel magazines, as well as in books, highlighting the storied golf history of Plaintiff's Pebble Beach golf course and resort.
- 11. Plaintiff has owned and operated The Spa at Pebble Beach since 1993. The Spa enjoys a widespread reputation in its marketplace as a premier spa destination, earning accolades by *Travel + Leisure Golf*, 2006, for Best [Spa] in the West/Northwest; *Condé Nast Traveler*, 2007, Top 50 North American Resort Spas; *Travel + Leisure* Magazine, 2008, #3 World's Best Hotel Spa; and most recently in 2012, the Spa was the recipient of a Four-Star Award by *Forhes Travel Guide*.
- 12. Plaintiff has invested substantial sums of money to advertise and promote goods and services under its PEBBLE BEACH marks.
- 13. Plaintiff owns common law and federally registered marks for PEBBLE BEACH for a variety of products and services, including golf course facilities, resort services, spa services, and hotel and restaurant services. *E.g.*, U.S. Trademark Reg. Nos. 768,208; 1,065,027; 1,571,563; 1,605,005; 1,724,418; 1,806,360; 1,884,513; 2,457,508; 3,466,613; 3,604,966, among others. (Collectively Plaintiff's PEBBLE BEACH common law and federally registered marks are referred to as Plaintiff's "PEBBLE BEACH Marks.")
- 14. Plaintiff's PEBBLE BEACH Marks are famous and were so long before the conduct complained of in this Complaint.

-3-

#### Facts Giving Rise to Plaintiff's Claims

- 15. Despite Plaintiff's long-established rights in Plaintiff's PEBBLE BEACH Marks, Defendant commenced use of the mark PEBBLE BEACH to advertise, promote and sell spas. See, e.g., Ex. A.
- 16. Defendant and Defendant's distributors sell the PEBBLE BEACH spa under their "Club Series," which features the spa advertised against the background of a golf course. *See*, *e.g.*, Ex. A. The other spas in Defendants' "Club Series" are also named after well-known golf courses or golf resorts. *See*, *e.g.*, Ex. B.
- 17. On November 6, 2012, Plaintiff sent Defendant a cease and desist letter, demanding that Defendant cease use of Plaintiff's PEBBLE BEACH Marks.
- 18. Despite Defendant's receipt of Plaintiff's letter, Defendant and its dealers continue to use Plaintiff's PEBBLE BEACH Marks, including on Defendant's web site and on the web sites of its various dealers throughout the United States. *See, e.g.*, Exs. A and B.
- 19. Defendant's actions are knowing, willful, and deliberate, and done with the intent to trade off the goodwill and reputation associated with Plaintiff's PEBBLE BEACH Marks.

### COUNT I

### TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT, UNFAIR COMPETITION AND FALSE DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN UNDER THE LANHAM ACT (15 U.S.C. §§ 1114, 1125)

- 20. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates each and every allegation contained in the paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 21. Plaintiff owns numerous federally registered and common law marks for PEBBLE BEACH for a variety of goods and services, including golf services and spa services. E.g., U.S. Trademark Reg. Nos. 1,028,939; 1,065,027; 1,724,418; 1,738,373; 1,765,946; 1,767,424; 1,776,631; 1,806,360; 2,844,431; 3,466,613; 3,530,929 and 3,538,302.
- 22. Defendant is using marks identical and substantially identical to Plaintiff's federally registered PEBBLE BEACH Marks to offer for sale and sell products, including spas.
- 23. Defendant's unauthorized use of Plaintiff's PEBBLE BEACH Marks constitutes trademark infringement, unfair competition and false designation of origin in violation of 15

-4-

U.S.C. §§ 1114 and 1125, because such conduct is likely to cause confusion, mistake or deception as to source, origin, affiliation, connection or association of Defendant's products.

- 24. Defendant's acts have caused Plaintiff to lose control over the reputation and goodwill associated with Plaintiff's PEBBLE BEACH Marks.
- 25. Plaintiff has suffered damages and Defendant has obtained profits and/or unjust enrichment as a result of Defendant's wrongful conduct.
- 26. Defendant's acts irreparably injure Plaintiff's business, reputation and goodwill.

  Unless Defendant is enjoined from its wrongful conduct, Plaintiff will continue to suffer irreparable injury and harm, for which Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.

### COUNT II TRADEMARK DILUTION UNDER THE LANHAM ACT (15 U.S.C. § 1125(e))

- 27. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates each and every allegation contained in the paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 28. Plaintiff's PEBBLE BEACH marks for golfing, resort and spa services are "distinctive" and "famous" within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c)(1).
- 29. Defendant commenced use of Plaintiff's PEBBLE BEACH Marks after those marks had become distinctive and famous.
- 30. Defendant's unauthorized use of Plaintiff's PEBBLE BEACH Marks is likely to dilute Plaintiff's famous PEBBLE BEACH marks by impairing the distinctiveness of those marks, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125(c).
- 31. Defendant's acts irreparably injure Plaintiff's business, reputation and goodwill.

  Unless Defendant is enjoined from its wrongful conduct, Plaintiff will continue to suffer irreparable injury and harm, for which Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.

#### COUNT III

### TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT, UNFAIR COMPETITION AND FALSE DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN UNDER CALIFORNIA LAW

32. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates each and every allegation contained in the paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.

- 33. Defendant's unauthorized use of PEBBLE BEACH constitutes trademark infringement, unfair competition, and false designation of origin, in violation of California common law and California Business & Professions Code § 17200, because it is likely to cause confusion, mistake or deception as to source, origin, affiliation, connection or association.
- 34. Defendant's acts have caused Plaintiff to lose control over the reputation and goodwill associated with Plaintiff's PEBBLE BEACH Marks.
- 35. Plaintiff has suffered damages and Defendant has obtained profits and/or unjust enrichment as a result of Defendant's wrongful conduct.
- 36. Defendant's acts irreparably injure Plaintiff's business, reputation and goodwill.

  Unless Defendant is enjoined from its wrongful conduct, Plaintiff will continue to suffer irreparable injury and harm, for which Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.

### COUNT IV CALIFORNIA TRADEMARK DILUTION (CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §14330)

- 37. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates each and every allegation contained in the paragraphs above as though fully set forth herein.
- 38. Plaintiff's PEBBLE BEACH Marks are distinctive and famous within the meaning of California Business and Professions Code § 14330.
- 39. Defendant commenced use of Plaintiff's PEBBLE BEACH Marks after those marks had become famous and distinctive.
- 40. Defendant's unauthorized use of PEBBLE BEACH is diluting and is likely to dilute Plaintiff's famous PEBBLE BEACH Marks, by impairing the distinctiveness of those marks, which constitutes injury to business reputation and/or dilution in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 14330.
- 41. Defendant's acts irreparably injure Plaintiff's business, reputation and goodwill.

  Unless Defendant is enjoined from its wrongful conduct, Plaintiff will continue to suffer irreparable injury and harm, for which Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law.

4

9

1.3

12

15

14

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

28

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, based on the foregoing allegations. Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant as follows:

- 1. That this Court enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendant on all claims for relief alleged herein;
  - 2. That this Court issue a preliminary and permanent injunction:
    - a. enjoining Defendant, its employees, owners, agents, officers, directors, attorneys, representatives, affiliates, subsidiaries, successors and assigns, and all those in active concert or participation with them or having knowledge of the causes of action, including Defendant's dealers, from using Plaintiff's PEBBLE BEACH Marks, alone or in combination with any other word(s), term(s), designation(s), mark(s), and/or design(s), as well as all similar marks;
    - b. requiring Defendant to deliver up for destruction all literature, signs, billboards, labels, prints, packages, wrappers, containers, advertising materials, stationery, and other items in their possession, custody or control that use PEBBLE BEACH pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1118; and
    - c. requiring Defendant to file with the Court and serve on Plaintiff, within thirty (30) days after entry of an injunction, a report in writing under oath setting forth in detail the manner in which Defendants have complied with the Court's injunction;
  - 3. That this Court grant monetary relief in the form of:
    - an accounting to Plaintiff of any and all profits derived by Defendant from the acts complained of herein;
    - Plaintiff's general, special and/or actual damages, along with any other damages allowable under 15 U.S.C. § 1117 and any other applicable statute or at common law, according to proof at trial;

1	c. a trebling of the damages awarded to Plaintiff and an enhanced award of					
2	Defendant's profits to Plaintiff, as provided for by 15 U.S.C. §1117(a);					
3	d. Plaintiff's costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §					
4	1117(a) and California common and statutory law; and					
5	e. punitive or exemplary damages, as permitted by California law.					
6	4. That this Court grant Plaintiff such other and further relief, in law or in equity, as it					
7	should deem just and proper.					
8	JURY DEMAND					
9	Plaintiff respectfully demands a trial by jury on all claims and issues so triable.					
10						
11	Dated: December 12, 2012 Respectfully submitted,					
12	McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP					
13	By:					
14	Terrence McMahon Philip Qu					
15	McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 275 Middlefield Road, Suite 100					
16	Menlo Park, CA 94025					
17	Telephone: (650) 815-7400 Facsimile: (650) 815-7401					
18	tmcmahon@mwe.com pou@mwe.com					
19						
20	John J. Dabney (pro hac vice pending)					
21	Mary D. Hallerman ( <i>pro hac vice pending</i> ) McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP					
22	500 North Capitol Street Washington, D.C. 20001					
23	Telephone: (202) 756-8000 Facsimile: (202) 756-8087					
24	jdabney@mwe.com					
25	mhallerman@mwe.com					
26	Attorneys for Plaintiff PEBBLE BEACH COMPANY					
27	DM_US 40261148-1.070166.0349					
28						
	ſ					